India

FOR THE

No. 80. New Series.
No. 174. Old Series.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, JULY 14, 1899.

Registered as a Newspaper. Price...... 2d By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 13
The Case for Revision 16
A Gold Standard for India 17
The Condition of the Country 18
Our London Letter 19
Chronicle of the Week 20
Judicial and Executive Functions ... 21
Letter to the Editor: Indian High Court Judges 21
Indian Currency Committee Report: Press Opinions 22
Indian Affairs in Parliament: Special Report 23
Advertisements 24

⁂ An Index with Title page to Volume XI of INDIA *(January to June, 1899) is now ready. A copy will be forwarded gratis and post free to any Subscriber on application to the Manager.*

NOTES AND NEWS.

THE *Times* published yesterday (Thursday) an important telegram from its Allahabad correspondent, stating that the long controversy regarding the reform of the Calcutta Corporation has had an unexpected termination:—

Sir Alexander Mackenzie's Bill, as amended by the Select Committee, was submitted to the Government of India, and the Viceroy's views are now conveyed in a long letter to the Bengal Government, in which, reviewing the whole situation, he says that Sir A. Mackenzie's Bill "might not in practice ensure that amicable and patriotic co-operation of all parties in the future municipal government of the city which is essential to efficient administration." The letter proceeds to say that the corporation's proneness to speech and criticism instead of action is mainly attributable to its excessive numbers, which, "when viewed with regard either to the numbers of electors by whom the majority are returned, or to the experience of municipal institutions elsewhere, seem disproportionately and unnecessarily large." It is accordingly proposed to reduce the total number from 75 to 50, of whom 25 are to be elected as now by the 25 city wards, and 25 are to be partially nominated as now by the Government and partially elected by representative commercial bodies. The Bombay model is thus reproduced with smaller numbers, and, following the same model, the general committee of the corporation will have one-third of its total of 12 members nominated by the Government, the rest being elected by the corporation.

Moreover, the Viceroy's letter referred "to the able Note of Dissent and the frank and intelligent criticism of the Native members of the Bengal Council." On the face of it, the revised version of the Bill is a vast improvement on the original, which was condemned chiefly on the ground that it reduced self-government to a farce by giving the Government absolute control of the general committee. Under the new scheme the Government nominates only one-third of the members of the committee, while two-thirds are elected by the Corporation. It follows that the Corporation will at least control the committee. How far the Corporation will be really representative is a question which cannot be determined without fuller information. The nominated members, it will be seen, are to be as numerous as the elected members, though it is not clear how the 25 nominated members are to be apportioned between the Government and the "representative commercial bodies." On the face of the matter, however, Lord Curzon's intervention has been in the direction of reason and justice, and he deserves credit for it. Certainly nothing could be more true than his proposition that the "amicable and patriotic co-operation of all parties in the future municipal government of the city" is "essential to efficient administration." The Calcutta Municipal Bill would never have seen the light if its authors had not ignored that elementary truth.

The writer of "Indian Affairs" in the *Times* of July 12 speaks out in manly fashion upon the grievances of British Indians in the Transvaal. He says:

Some of these are men of wealth and position, accustomed in their own country to the amenities of an ancient civilisation, and to dignities and honours as the reward of commercial enterprise or public spirit. They belong to the classes which supply a valuable element in the governing bodies of the great Indian municipalities, and from which able members of the Indian Legislature are drawn. In the Transvaal they are, to use Sir Alfred Milner's term in its strictest sense, helots, subjected to insults and degradations which the friends of England watch with wonder and her enemies with delight.

He sets forth in outline facts that have already been printed and commented upon in these columns. Coming down to the latest suspension of the order for removal to locations, he concludes thus:—

But to the great body of British Indian merchants in the Transvaal it is a reprieve, not a pardon. If once the present pressure is removed the old oppression will recommence. Yet these merchants are the fellow-countrymen of the young cricketer who held the wicket at Notts for England, of the young scholar bracketed Senior Wrangler at Cambridge this summer, of the young administrator who the other year headed the Indian Civil Service list, of the young savant who lately received an ovation from English men of science, and of the young Indian artist who has just arrived with good will from Paris, Munich, and Rome.

Sir William Wedderburn, as Chairman of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, addressed the following letter, under date July 11, to the Colonial Secretary:—

I have received the following telegram from the British Indians in the Transvaal:

"Transvaal Government refuses licenses except to Indians living in the locations. What must we do? We will be ruined. Please inform Mr. Chamberlain."

In this connexion you will remember that on former occasions communications to the Colonial Office have been made by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and myself on the subject of similar grievances in Natal, and it occurs to me that any representation to the South African Republic will come with more force if we can show that British Indian grievances have already been redressed in our own Colonies.

We have on several occasions pointed out how advantageous it would be to clear our own eye of this beam in order to enable us to address ourselves more effectively to the task of getting the mote out of President Kruger's eye.

We hope that Mr. Paranjpye's head is screwed on firmly enough to resist the gyrating influence of such a cyclone of laudation as he has brought upon himself. But we must record the terms of the very agreeable telegram that the Viceroy, on learning Mr. Paranjpye's success, sent to the Principal of Fergusson College, Poona:

The Viceroy desires to congratulate you, as Principal of Fergusson College, upon the brilliant success attained by a former pupil of the college in carrying off the blue ribbon of English scholarship. Such a triumph is a wonderful tribute both to the teaching of the College and to the capabilities of the most highly trained Indian intellect.

Well said, and handsomely done.

In another column we print a letter accompanying a Memorial adopted by the Indian Parliamentary Committee, in which the urgency of the separation of judicial and executive functions in India is once more pressed upon the attention of Lord George Hamilton. With surpluses in hand and in prospect, the time certainly seems opportune for taking at least first steps in a reform that touches so nearly the welfare of the Indian community and is universally demanded. The grounds of the demand have been exhaustively set forth, and the eminent judicial names attached to the Memorial leave no more to be said. It is now a mere question of finance, and it would be hard to say what other reform has a better claim than the adequate administration of justice to the people.

Now that the Indian Currency Committee has issued its Report we are reminded that Lord Curzon gallantly stated in the discussion on the Budget that "we reserve our entire liberty to examine and consider" the impending "momentous changes in the financial system of the Indian empire" "when they are submitted to us by her Majesty's Government, as the result of the expert enquiry now proceeding in London." Well, the Indian Government gets its gold standard, but it does not get its £20,000,000 to back the new expedient. What will the Governor-General in Council do? Will he stand by his brave words? For, as the *Pioneer* tells him, "they mean little if they do not imply that in the event of disagreement the Indian Government would not hesitate to assert its own

view." It would be interesting to behold the Indian Government with Lord Curzon at its head "asserting its own view" against Lord George Hamilton; for we take it Lord George will not throw over Sir Henry Fowler's Committee, especially when Lord George and Sir Henry are, as the *Pioneer* puts it, "in close alliance." No; the bold Viceroy, with all Lord George's profession of resolute non-interference with the "independence" of local legislatures, will just do as he is bidden. "As a practical matter," justly remarks the *Pioneer*, "there is little or no chance of such deadlocks." "Deadlocks" is distinctly humorous.

It is the common talk of those who pose as the defenders of our rule in India that (1) the Indians like better to serve an Englishman than an Indian, and (2) in no sense are the Indians a homogeneous people. The *Englishman* in an article on "British and Native Rule," incidentally denies both these propositions. As to the first the Anglo-Indian organ says:—

It is only those who have a superficial knowledge of India who say that the Natives prefer British to Native rule, would rather serve an Englishmen than one of their own countrymen.

As to the second, it remarks:—

In some directions, in spite of multitudes of creeds and numberless tribal divisions, the Natives of India may be looked on as a homogeneous whole.

But the propositions here so explicitly denied are being constantly used both to bar the promotion of Indian officials and to discount any utterances professing to represent the views of the Indian people.

When Dr. Fairbairn spoke of the missionaries as symbolising British "duty," and of the civilians as representing British "power," the antithesis probably led him beyond his real meaning. At any rate, it is not surprising that the pronouncement has evoked energetic dissent in civilian quarters. A correspondent of the *Pioneer* writes:

Not to speak of high officials of strong character who have inspired all Indians with whom they came in contact with that personal devotion which has proved the best channel into elevated lives and elevating motives, and with whom only a missionary or two once in a generation can be brought into any kind of comparison, there have been hundreds of officials, civil and military, who have proved a revelation to the toiling masses among whom they have laboured and often laid down their lives. To compare the life-work of such persons with that of the majority of ordinary missionaries may or may not be absurd, according to the point of view from which people view things. But to say of their work that it is a type of the power of England in India, which needs to be supplemented by the conception of duty as that is symbolised by missionaries—that is to say, that it represents brute force, which has no moral meaning until brightened and beautified by something gone through by others—is surely to add to the already numerous difficulties which ignorance, conceit or precipitancy, or all together, have piled up on the heads of honest and intelligent students of the phenomena of the Indian administration.

No doubt Dr. Fairbairn will give just weight to this most reasonable remonstrance.

The *Madras Mail* has been looking into the statistics of the last Congress, and tries to found thereon a thesis that that body has no right to the title of "national." The grounds on which it bases this are: that (1) the Madras delegates greatly outnumbered those from other Provinces; (2) the Hindus were in a great majority; (3) more than two-thirds of these were Brahmins; and (4) nearly half the delegates—270 out of 614—were lawyers. Now it is to be expected that more delegates would attend from places near at hand than from the more remote parts of the country. Even in England, which is small in comparison, the attendance at annual congresses depends in some measure on the place chosen. Lancashire would be better represented at Manchester than at Plymouth. How much more then in India, where the distances are so great! As the Congress passes from one Province to another the numbers from each will vary, but unless divisions of opinion should arise which follow the geographical divisions of the country—and such has not hitherto been the case—the representative character of the work of the Congress will not be affected.

As to the Hindus being in an overwhelming majority, they are in a majority in the country. They have been more ready than the Mahometans to take advantage of that European education without which the Congress would have been an impossibility. Therefore it is natural that their numerical preponderance in that body should be even greater than it is in the country. But Mahometans, Parsees, and even Native Christians were represented. How little weight can be attached to the mere number of delegates coming from any particular section of the people may be judged from there being only two Parsees, though that community has furnished some of the most famous leaders of the movement. That there were great numbers of Brahmins is only what might have been expected. They have always been at the head of the Hindus. If they did not take that position in the Congress, it might well be held that that body could not be representative of the Hindu community. As to the number of lawyers, that is a characteristic of such assemblies in other countries besides India. Even in the English Parliament, in spite of the peculiar power of the landed interest, they have always been well represented. In the most famous French Assemblies, they have been even more numerous than in the Madras Congress. And in India there is an especial reason for lawyers occupying a foremost position. The bar has been the great road of advancement open to the Indian. A Judgeship of the High Court—the top of the profession—lies open to him; and therefore the law has claimed the lion's share of Native talent.

The *Pioneer*, while warmly supporting the Government in their action on the sugar question, and though fully satisfied with the recent division in the House of Commons, yet finds Lord George Hamilton's speech on that occasion not quite suitable. It is angry with Lord George because he did not flout the British electorate, and put his foot down on the heresy that "the British elector knows better what is or is not good for India's financial interests than the Governor-General in Council." With more reason our Anglo-Indian contemporary thinks that the allusion to "danger ahead" in India might have been omitted. It sees the folly of continually bringing this idea forward, whenever the Secretary of State wants to strengthen his argument, till the thought that the British Raj is not firmly established sinks into unsettled minds, and the danger feared is at last provoked. The *Pioneer* says "loyal subjects of the Queen-Empress are apt to consider bodings of this kind as neither very judicious nor very dignified." Certainly they are not.

The *Financial News*, discussing the "Moral and Material" Statement, notes a slight increase in the output of cotton from the Native factories, "while Lancashire lost a substantial amount of trade, suffering the full force of the recent adverse conditions in India." Our contemporary remarks:—

Complete statistics of the output of Indian factories are not available; but the Statement reproduces some figures relating to the Bombay Presidency, in which the industry mainly resides. It thence appears that the total output of cotton mills in the British districts of Bombay for 1897-98 was 323,000,000lb. of yarn and 70,000,000lb. of woven goods—an increase of 6⅝ per cent. on the previous year's output. Lancashire, we suppose, will see in this growth of the Indian industry a justification of the countervailing excise. For our part we still question the wisdom and justice of favouring a particular English industry in this manner. It hampers the legitimate development of India, and puts her at a disadvantage with all other British possessions. Besides, other British industries do not enjoy the favour in the Indian market. Why should cotton be so privileged?

Why, because those whose duty it is to provide for "the legitimate development of India," and to see that India is not "put at a disadvantage with other British possessions," consider it a prior duty to conciliate votes in Lancashire. India of course must be kept out of the vortex of party politics!

In an article on the new Railway Administration Report the *Pioneer* remarks that, "as everyone acknowledges, we are now on the threshold of a new era in Indian railway administration." We have already urged the prudence of going slowly in railway development, but Lord Curzon is as hot for "the investment of British capital" in Indian railways as is Sir Henry Fowler himself. The *Pioneer* says:—

Even if the whole basis of the Government State Railway administration is not remoulded, the time has come when certain features must be reconsidered. It cannot always go on being supposed that the needs of the country and the schemes submitted by private enterprise for meeting them are satisfactorily disposed of by means of a strictly private conference of officials who do not hear promoters on behalf of their own projects, and cannot even communicate to them the decision that has been arrived at on their proposals. Nor can it be imagined that the system of parcelling out the country into spheres of influence, keeping this for one gauge and that for another, of arbitrarily stopping one line here and forbidding another to extend

there, however much the extension may be needed, because it is opposed to the conventions—is a system that can last for ever.

So far at any rate we are in cordial agreement with our contemporary.

The ravages of enteric fever among the European troops in India rose in 1897 from 6·31 to 9·01 per 1,000, the majority of the victims being "young and unacclimatised." The statistics ought to put somebody on enquiry as to the cause or causes of this very grave result. The Rawalpindi correspondent of the *Pioneer* says: "Pindi is, I suppose, one of the cleanest cantonments in India." It "rejoices in a couple of cantonment magistrates," and "nearly all the drains about the place are carefully bricked and are constantly flushed down, while all objectionable matter quickly clears away owing to the steep gradients round about." Further, "the water supply is supposed to be above suspicion," and "the milk is carefully looked after, as, indeed, is pretty well everything which the British soldier is provided with." And yet "that curse of modern India, enteric, is filling the cemeteries." How is this? The correspondent puts a pertinent question, although he does not seem to perceive its significance. He asks: "Why should the British soldier get enteric right and left when the women and children in barracks, who drink the same water and live in the same place as he does, practically don't get it at all?" Probably there is less mystery in the matter than he imagines, and there is no urgent need to have recourse to inoculation, even if inoculation were better justified by results than it is. One would guess that soldiers drink water outside, as well as inside, barracks, and not always with discrimination. They want to be personally looked after with more vigilance. "Meanwhile the funerals succeed each other with mournful regularity."

The advance of sugar cultivation and manufacture in Java has alarmed the *Pioneer*, which discerns in the Dutch possession an approaching "serious rival with Mauritius in contending against the Indian sugar refining industry for the Indian markets." Though only 8,125 tons came from Java in 1898-99, while 89,680 came from Mauritius, yet the Dutch figures mean an increase of 16 per cent. on the prevous year, which again showed an increase of 25½ per cent. on the average of the four preceding years. Then the total production of Java is about five times that of Mauritius, and the re-establishment of the Cuban plantations will probably enough divert the Javan article to India. "Then away go the benefits of the countervailing duties, for it would be no great thing for the Indian sugar industry if beet sugar is only to be ousted to make room for Java." Just so. We now begin to awaken partially to the length we must go with our countervailing duties. Java will not come under the Tariff Act, for Java has no bounty or other form of State aid. Are we, then, to have unabashed Protection all round? They must needs go that the devil drives. It is a pleasant sign of grace, however, that the *Pioneer* looks around for possible means of regenerating the Indian industry. "There seems to be no insuperable reason—or, if so, it has not been satisfactorily explained"—it says, "why the methods which have brought the sugar industry in Java to such a pitch of prosperity should not be gradually introduced into India." Now we get on to the right economic track—a track that we ought to have been pacing before the Tariff Act, which in that case would never have been inflicted on the country at all. As in other matters, so in sugar, India must gird her loins and fight her own battle.

The caste riots between the Maravars and the Shanars are said to have extended over an area of 100 miles by 70 miles in the districts of Tinnevelly and Madura. The accompanying acts of violence, if natural enough in the circumstances, are very deplorable; and, though the authorities are not to be rashly judged, it does seem that there must be a screw loose somewhere, beyond the ill-advised change of District Magistrates in Tinnevelly at such a critical juncture. Disturbances involving religious animosities are the very last sort of popular unrest to be let out of hand. There is something to be said for the Shanars. They are industrious people, and by their industry they have prospered, and as a consequence they look for larger social recognition. But they are—the 700,000 of them—chiefly engaged in toddy-extraction, "toddy" being palm-juice; and this liquor traffic makes them "unclean." They must stand 24 paces off a Brahmin. Against this caste inferiority they have struggled for more than half a century. Surely, in all that period, some gradual accommodation should have been established. On the present occasion, which is only one of a series of disturbances, though a somewhat formidable one, the Shanars are said to have arrogated the title of Kshatriyas, to have demanded entrance to the temples, and to have actually entered the temple at Sivakasi in Tinnevelly, though closed by the trustees. This was the first unfortunate step. The Maravars, on the other hand, being the most important military caste in the extreme south, and withal "clean," were not unnaturally much exasperated at the pretensions of the Shanars, and infuriated by their trespass on the temple. With full knowledge of these combustible elements, the authorities ought to have kept a firm grip on both factions. Difficult as any accommodation must be, yet some tentative process ought to be judiciously attempted as soon as the present fury has cooled down. There is no other possibility of satisfactory relations. A permanent state of siege is anything but social order.

An Anglo-Indian correspondent writes:—"'The obstacles placed in the way of Indian enterprise by the rules of the Public Works Department concerning the local purchases of iron work and stores.' This is a portion of a long sentence with which the *Times of India* (June 24) opens an article on the subject indicated. We are using this fragment because it may remind our readers that it is high time the authorities were thrown on the defensive in this matter; also those of us who have so long sought to encourage the local industries of India and utilisation of its indigenous materials should adopt a more aggressive and insistent attitude. So far as the principle of the question goes there is no dispute—that is, that in the selection and purchase of materials for construction and of consumable stores, the authorities shall, in their purchases and contracts, give preference to those that can be obtained on the spot. It goes without saying that in such local purchasing the cost shall never exceed that at which similar materials could be obtained through the (expensive) agency of the Stores Department of the India Office here.

"But in the application and administration of this principle arise or are interposed these 'obstacles placed in the way of Indian enterprise,' against which we are glad to find the Bombay daily energetically protesting. In so doing the writer founds himself mainly upon practical examples of those artificial vexations and artificial 'obstacles,' such as are set out by an excellent professional journal, the *Indian and Eastern Enquirer*. It would be no use our attempting here to summarise the intelligent exposure of the alternate pottering and ponderous 'rules' through which the Public Works Department strives to safeguard the principles on which local purchases should proceed. Our Bombay contemporary gives due credit to the motives of public economy that underlie these rules; but shows how these strained precautions discredit the principle itself, and thus become 'obstacles in the way of Indian enterprise.' Our friends in India who, in their social and provincial congresses, have earnestly striven to develop local enterprise and promote the diversity of industries, will, we are sure, avail themselves of the revived movement in the Anglo-Indian press in this direction.

"That movement was first taken in hand and definitively worked out by Sir Evelyn Baring when Finance Minister in the Marquis of Ripon's Government. It has been reaffirmed in special orders under other Viceroys; and this has been necessary because the constructive and productive principle of utilising local materials has been overlaid by departmental rules and official 'obstacles.' In June last year a fresh start was made under the comprehensive resolution then issued. To this appeal is now made, under the encouragement drawn from several of Lord Curzon's public remarks on this subject. The Bombay journal is well aware that the grand obstructor of the policy of local purchases is to be found in the Stores Department of the India Office. And the writer, with faith which we would hope is not misplaced, trusts that 'Lord Welby's long-delayed report' may do something to expose that costly obstruction, and show some means of curtailing its misdirected activity in creating and maintaining 'obstacles placed in the way of Indian enterprise.'"

THE CASE FOR REVISION.

THE striking unanimity with which the English Press have declared all along for justice to Dreyfus, and the joy with which they have received the recent decree of the Court of Cassation, suggest that such a miscarriage of justice would be impossible throughout the British Empire. Least of all would the patriotic Englishman think that anything of such a nature could occur in India, where the purity of British justice has ever shone with so clear a light, and where the blessings conferred by British magistrates and administrators have been held to atone for many sins committed in acquiring our Empire and for many shortcomings in the early days of our rule. That we have shown the people of our great dependency how beautiful a thing justice is has become an axiom with many of us. To say that a monstrous injustice comparable only to that inflicted on Dreyfus had been committed under our flag would seem an incredible fiction. Yet it would be only the literal and unvarnished truth.

There are many points in which the case of the Natus and the case of Dreyfus are curiously parallel, and where they differ the difference is not always to the disadvantage of the military justice of France. If we ask what were the circumstances that have especially impressed the more thinking part of the French people and have gradually brought about the belief that revision was necessary they would be found to be these: the secrecy observed, the want of harmony between the explanations and defences given, the fear that some of the evidence was tainted with vindictiveness, the use of the horror excited by the crime to injure the supposed criminal, and the introduction of forgery and unfair procedure at the trial and after. Now all these elements, excepting the last, have been present in the case of the Natus. Nor can it much benefit those who have defended the detention of the Natus that there has been no recourse to forged documents or to an unfair trial; for there has been no trial at all, and it can scarcely be argued that it is worse to be tried unfairly than to remain in prison without even knowing the charges brought against you—to have one document concealed than to have all concealed.

That the Natus were condemned to a long imprisonment for reasons with which they were never made acquainted, and without any opportunity of defence, is admitted. Nor can it be denied that in such explanations of the conduct of the Bombay Government as Lord George Hamilton has deigned to make, different and contradictory motives have been assigned. A connexion with the Poona murders, brought forward, but not afterwards insisted on, has been apparently intended to provoke that general horror of the crime which has so often been used to bias public opinion against accused persons. The trivial accusation of interfering with a midwife's practice, which ultimately replaced that of conspiracy to murder, was tainted by the circumstance that the nurse had already been engaged in a suit against the elder Natu; and although forgery has never been proved, it will not be forgotten that the authenticity of a letter in which the midwife was threatened, has been strenuously denied by the Natus. Finally, that the parallel may be rendered almost complete, Lord George Hamilton has made the same use of the independence of the Bombay Government that a succession of French Ministers did of the *chose jugée*, two defences which for unblushing hypocrisy may well be linked together. Lord George Hamilton could not think of dictating to the Bombay Government. The Ministers of War could not think of interfering with a just and legal condemnation, brought about by the illegal procedure of one of their own number. Exposure has overtaken General Mercier. Will it be long in overtaking Lord George Hamilton? Or will the public have to judge of the sincerity of his plea that he cannot interfere with the independence of Bombay by his published correspondence in which he in so many other matters—notably the Sedition Acts—has brought pressure to bear on the Government of India.

It would not, indeed, be fair to accuse the gaolers in whose charge the Natus were kept of the extreme cruelty practised on Dreyfus. But yet the petitions of the elder of the two brothers show that their imprisonment was accompanied by much physical hardship and suffering—unnecessary if the only object was to keep them from doing mischief, monstrous if the object was to punish them for crimes of which they had never been found guilty. Nor were there wanting other aggravations of their position. The eye of Europe has long been fixed on the pathetic figure of Lucie Dreyfus, but the Natus also had wives and children. Their old mother never recovered from the shock of their arrest, and died while her sons were far away in prison. The family of Dreyfus were left their property at least, and whatever his other miseries, the prisoner of the Devil's Island had not to think of his wife as in want of money, or anything money could buy; but the Natus found their whole property seized, some of it illegally, and saw their families reduced to subsist on a monthly allowance, which for a time remained unpaid. If the dignity and tenderness of the letters of Dreyfus have won him friends, surely the petitions of the elder Natu should do the same for him. Sufferings patiently borne, unbroken self-respect, unflinching courage, and moderation to his enemies, these are hardly the characteristics of guilt. Those who read the Sirdar Natu's letters, will find that there is a similarity, not only to the fate of Dreyfus, but also to the bearing by which that fate has been met.

There is, however, as has been already mentioned, one point in which the two cases strikingly differ. Dreyfus had a trial, in which some part of the evidence shown to the members of the court martial was hidden from him. The Natus have never been tried at all, and have been kept in ignorance both of the crime charged against them and of the whole evidence produced in support of it. They have never been allowed to meet one of their accusers face to face. They have never been allowed to call an atom of evidence in their defence. They were not even allowed to see their solicitor. They have been all along in the position of untried prisoners. Under this heading, "Untried prisoners," there appeared in a recent number of the *Spectator* some words which are peculiarly applicable to the Natus, and it will be seen that at the very point where the analogy of the case of the Natus with that of Dreyfus fails, we find a complete correspondence with that of Colonel Picquart. Here are the *Spectator's* words:—

> Nothing, perhaps, in the Dreyfus case has so startled and shocked the English public as the treatment of Colonel Picquart. The wrong done to Captain Dreyfus was in the first instance unintentional. By whatever road the Court-Martial came to their conclusion, and whatever may have been the violation of justice involved in the means by which they were induced to take that road, there is no reason to doubt that the verdict was the verdict of men who believed that a crime had been committed, and that it had been brought home to the prisoner. But in Colonel Picquart's case there was no trial, and consequently no proof of guilt. He was placed in confinement in order that the truth of the charges brought against him might be examined, and there those who ought to have pushed on matters allowed him to remain. He was out of the way—powerless to do any more mischief if he were guilty, powerless to tell any inconvenient truths if he were innocent. In hundreds of leading articles all over England the iniquity of thus punishing a man in advance on a mere hypothesis that he might have done the things with which he was charged was held up, and rightly held up, to the strongest condemnation.

In the Natus' case, also, "there was no trial and consequently no proof of guilt"; but that which is a crime of the deepest dye in officers of the French army, is quite consistent with justice and righteousness, when the perpetrators are Anglo-Indian officials or an English Secretary of State. The public opinion of England has looked on in silence at the detention of two Indians without trial; it has shrieked with horror at the detention of a French officer. All rules have been reversed. The wrongs that came within its own province, that were done in the British Empire, and would tarnish the British name have been passed over or condoned. The wrongs committed by a neighbouring people, for which we were in no way responsible, have been denounced on every possible occasion. Thus do we read the old parable of the mote and the beam, and wax proud of our own exceeding virtue.

And, seriously, have we not here another case for revision? Is it not necessary that this tangled mass of secret accusation and incoherent explanation should at last see the light and justice be done? Is France alone to have the honour of bravely attempting to undo the wrong, and are we still to adhere obstinately to the dark ways in which we have walked? Is Dreyfus to have a full, a fair, and an open trial, and are the Natus to remain subject to restrictions, and without opportunity of defence? Punishment without trial is always odious even in the most serious emergency; and here we have the punishment lasting for years, while now the very Anglo-Indians cry shame. And yet we prate of British justice, and thank God we are not

as those wicked Frenchmen are. It is in vain that the men who have revived one of the worst practices of the Inquisition — the concealment of the charge from the accused—try to maintain their policy of silence, or that Lord George Hamilton, after accepting responsibility for the detention of the Natus, insists that the Bombay Government is alone responsible on the question of their release. Such subterfuges only make more urgent the case for revision.

A GOLD STANDARD FOR INDIA.

THE Report of the Indian Currency Committee, which was issued on Saturday, confirms the anticipations of both friends and foes of the official design to impose upon India a gold standard. It was tolerably plain that the Secretary of State and his advisers had taken the bit in their teeth; and, as we pointed out some fourteen months ago, the constitution of the Committee, in spite of Lord George Hamilton's fair words, was not such as to inspire confidence that its deliberations would result in a thoroughly competent and unprejudiced conclusion. A lop-sided Committee, overweighted with official members, weakly represented in its banking and commercial elements, and not containing a single native of India to watch the deepest interest of all, could hardly have done otherwise than come to a lop-sided decision. Nor will the public readily believe that, with every intention of honest independence on the part of individual members, there was not an influential environment indirectly operating throughout the whole enquiry—the known straits of the Government of India and the strong feeling in high quarters as to the proper means of relief. Lord George Hamilton, expressly measuring his language, had declared that "India was unquestionably nearing bankruptcy." "She could not pay her way," he said, "and one of two things was inevitable—either that she would be unable to meet her obligations or that this country would have to come to her aid." For once Lord George Hamilton was right. What was to be done, then? The taxpayer was sucked well-nigh dry; the extravagance of loan upon loan was getting to be remarked in uncomplimentary terms. The Government must tack on to some fresh course. The waste of campaigns beyond the frontier and the inelasticity of a starved country within the frontier, the direct result of perverse misgovernment and anæmic administration, must somehow be hidden away. But what if this new and reckless expedient fail in its essential purpose?

The Committee deal with the various aspects of the subject under eight heads, and the Report is signed by all the eleven members, four of whom add subsidiary statements or reservations of little moment. The substance of the deliverance is contained in the following paragraph:—

> We are in favour of making the British sovereign a legal tender and a current coin in India. We also consider that, at the same time, the Indian Mints should be thrown open to the unrestricted coinage of gold on terms and conditions such as govern the three Australian branches of the Royal Mint. The result would be that, under identical conditions, the sovereign would be coined and would circulate both at home and in India. Looking forward as we do to the effective establishment in India of a gold standard and currency based on the principles of the free inflow and outflow of gold, we recommend these measures for adoption.

The Committee rejects all the proposals for establishing a gold standard without a gold currency—Mr. Lesley Probyn's bullion scheme, Mr. A. M. Lindsay's "exchange standard," and the analogous plans advanced by the late Mr. Raphael and by Major Darwin. It belittles the danger of hoarding: that wasteful form of thrift "does not present such practical difficulties as to justify a permanent refusal to allow India to possess the normal accompaniment of a gold standard, namely, a gold currency." So the Committee would like to see the British sovereign "a current coin in India." How current? Sir David Barbour not so very long ago despaired of the possibility of the circulation even of the half-sovereign. He at least would seem to have elevated his hopes. The whole position is factitious, and therefore unsound. Lord Farrer has told us that the history of the principle in England shows "a steady progress, conscious or unconscious, towards the adoption of a single gold standard, a progress due not solely or chiefly to the arbitrary acts of a Government, but to the wants and habits of the people, and to economical laws which neither governments nor people can neglect with impunity." We are ready to accept a gold standard on the same terms in India. But in India, at the present moment, the facts tell solidly in the reverse sense, and this gold standard is due not to the wants and habits of the people or to stern economical laws, but solely or chiefly to the arbitrary acts of the Government.

The first section of the Report sketches the history of the monetary system of India, but there is no practical element in it, for the sparse maintenance of a gold standard and a gold currency some generations back can count for very little to-day. The second section deals with the question whether, in the light of the six years' experience gained since 1893, it is desirable to reverse the policy initiated in that year and to reopen the Indian Mints to the unrestricted coinage of silver. On this point the evidence was no doubt very conflicting. The only aspect of the case now worth discussion is the proposal for immediate steps towards a gradual reopening; and this is not satisfactorily treated. The Committee rely on the allegation that "no scheme has been submitted to us which appears likely to attain the object in view." But what are the grounds of this unlikelihood? "In our opinion," says the Report, "any measures for gradual reopening would be so fully and immediately discounted as to defeat the precise objects for which they are suggested. It is obvious, moreover, that the certain prospect of a heavy fall in the exchange would at once drive capital from India." These grounds are obviously perfunctory and inadequate, and betray the fundamental dread of allowing the currency to move back, even gradually, to the natural basis of fact. Of course, there is not a ghost of a chance of an international agreement, and the fluctuations of exchange, in the absence of some such steadying influence, "constitute an obstacle to international trade." We have heard all this before; but no trader worth his salt has the least difficulty in discounting these bugbears. "It is not in the permanent interests of India," then, "that her foreign commerce, over 80 per cent. of which is with gold-standard countries, should be hampered by the restoration of silver monometallism." The Committee finds that "the general interests of India" lie in the same quarter; that is to say, that the Home charges have got to be paid in gold without bankrupting the Calcutta treasury. Not a word about a reform of the downward policy that has landed the Government in the muddle. Not a word about the true sources of the prosperity of India. The Committee's eyes are rivetted on the balancing of accounts, and it thinks to accomplish the feat by mere arithmetical processes, in blank neglect of the pulsing life of a great country in the throes of a mighty awakening. So it expresses concurrence with the Government of India in their decision "not to revert to the silver standard."

But every argument against silver may be applied in favour of gold, and the third section adds direct considerations on "the principle of a gold standard." "Four-fifths of the foreign trade of India is with gold-standard countries." But no such argument as this entered into the determination of a gold standard for England itself; it is a jesuitical support to British trade simply. Again, "an established gold standard is the simplest and most effective means of attracting capital." "The natural resources of India are beyond question, as also is the need for their development." Yes, let us hasten to exploit the resources of the country, and call it development. If we had statesmen with brains enough in their heads to penetrate beyond the mere husks of political affairs, they would give India peace, and definite securities for permanent peace; they would give India a breathing-space to accumulate her natural strength, and the opportunity of expending it upon her internal needs. And then she would develop spontaneously and soundly, and attract capital on fair terms and with the power of using it and of preventing it from binding her in permanent and intolerable fetters. But no; our statesmen dread the natural development of events; they will control events with a gold standard! They will bind Samson in withes, forsooth! Heaven help them!

The fourth section discusses the Indian Government's proposals, and rejects them. We have already ridiculed them, and the Committee only repeats the process with becoming gravity of expression. "As a matter of principle," however, "the Government of India favoured a gold standard with a gold currency," and that the Com-

mittee, as we have seen, approves. This exhausts the fifth section. Section six deals with convertibility:—

Under an effective gold standard rupees would be token coins, subsidiary to the sovereign. But existing conditions in India do not warrant the imposition of a limit on the amount for which they should constitute a legal tender; indeed, for some time to come, no such limitation can be contemplated.

No; because it would be unworkable. This just shows how artificial the whole arrangement is—an "arbitrary act of the Government," which not a man of this Committee would dare to suggest for England.

The exclusive right to coin fresh rupees must remain vested in the Government of India; and though the existing stock of rupees may suffice for some time, regulations will ultimately be needed for providing such additions to the silver currency as may prove necessary. The Government should continue to give rupees for gold, but fresh rupees should not be coined until the proportion of gold in the currency is found to exceed the requirements of the public. We also recommend that any profit on the coinage of rupees should not be credited to the revenue or held as a portion of the ordinary balance of the Government of India, but should be kept in gold as a special reserve, entirely apart from the paper currency reserve and the ordinary Treasury balances.

The seventh section fixes the sterling rate of the rupee at 1s. 4d. Mr. W. H. Holland, however, urges that the rate should not be fixed at once, but as further experience may show to be expedient, whether above or below 16d.; and Mr. Robert Campbell and Sir John Muir recommend 15d., not admitting that the experience of the last six years justifies 16d. The Report concludes with the pious opinion that "it is eminently desirable that the Government of India, with whom it will rest to decide when successive steps should be taken, should husband the resources at their command, exercise a resolute economy, and restrict the growth of their gold obligations." This is a fitting conclusion and confirmation of the Committee's fatuity. If the Government of India were capable of such prudent action, this difficulty and this Committee would never have been heard of. It is a counsel of perfection spoken to the winds. The coach is still headed in the wrong direction, and we can only thank the Committee for the application of a fairly strong brake.

THE CONDITION OF THE COUNTRY.

THERE are not many Blue-books that display so usefully in a narrow compass so many important facts as the annual "Statement exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India." The worst of it is that the form and the matter tend to become stereotyped, and that the official bias is hidden from the trustful public by deft reticence. Thus, with regard to the obnoxious Municipal Bill for Calcutta, it is simply stated that

proposals were made to amend the law so as to give more scope to the executive officers of the city, so as to secure adequate representation for trade and mercantile interests, and so as to reserve to the Government power to appoint the chief officers of the city in the sanitary and other departments.

This looks well, no doubt, in the eyes of a reader that knows nothing of the facts; but any tolerably careful reader of these columns will at once perceive how artfully it conceals the havoc that is to be made in the system of local self-government. At the other end of the volume there is a summary of the military operations beyond the North-West Frontier, conceived and executed on the same vicious principle.

The Secretary of State (we are told) pointed to religious excitement and fanaticism as the main cause of the outbreak, while he was inclined to attribute in some measure to the recent delimitation of the Afghan frontier the alarm and jealousy of the tribesmen on which this fanaticism was able to work. But whatever the causes, the disturbances began with. . . . .

And the writer, leaving the root of all the mischief in this utterly misleading position, hastens to plunge into details of the fighting. Even here, he is disingenuous enough to hide the ugly side of the shield. For instance, there is not a word to suggest the infamy of the abandonment of the Khaibar levies, or to show how severely General Jeffreys was handled, or to indicate effectively the frightful hardships imposed upon the troops by the perversities of military policy, or to let light in upon the real results of the campaign. "Arduous circumstances," "extreme and exceptional difficulties of the country," "inclemency of the season"; such general terms do not raise the true mental picture. Once more: the figures showing the mileage of railways, or canals, or the extent of other public works, give little idea of what is doing or contemplated; and there is but too seldom even the smallest hint of the policy involved in the various works of construction. The compilation might be rendered vastly more useful by a little more frankness with the public. The policy of the ostrich is neither dignified nor laudable.

The working of the municipal system generally, even on the official reports, has been exemplary during the past year. For the Calcutta municipality in particular there is no word either of praise or of blame. The general report contains this summary statement:—

The objects on which municipal funds can be spent are, mainly, water supply, hospitals and dispensaries, streets or roads, vaccination, drainage, sanitation, and education. Municipalities do more for the benefit of their citizens under these heads than was done before by Government officers, and the Commissioners and committees generally evince diligence and public spirit in the performance of their honorary duties. The interest in the municipal elections, and in municipal affairs generally, is not keen, save in a few cities and large towns; but, as education and knowledge advance, interest in the management of local affairs gradually increases. It is reported from most provinces that municipal work is fairly well done, and municipal responsibilities are, on the whole, faithfully discharged, though occasional shortcomings and failures occur in particular towns. The tendency of these local bodies is to be slow in imposing additional taxes, in adopting sanitary reforms, and in incurring new expenditure. Many members of municipal bodies are diligent in their attendance to work, whether at meetings for business or on benches for decision of petty criminal cases.

We have no means of forming any opinion on the weaknesses of municipal government here indicated; but, when full allowance is made, the positive side of the account must be regarded as overwhelming. Better results than those officially acknowledged it would be presumptuous to expect. The municipal plant is healthy and growing apace; it needs but warmth and light and air, and to be let alone. There is more wisdom in judicious oversight and kindly interest than in the Calcutta plan of pulling up by the roots. Manifestly, the municipal system, if prudently fostered, has a great destiny in the future.

The sections on finance and public works are little more than formal summaries of fuller accounts published separately. The details of land revenue in the various provinces offer numerous points of interest, often requiring elucidations that are not supplied; and one would like to pursue further such general statements as that "the State demand on any land is not enhanced on account of increased productiveness due to improvements made by the proprietors or occupiers themselves." The forest revenue seems small and inelastic; one can only hope that the large expenditure is applied in laying a sound base for future returns. Considering the importance of agriculture, fuller explanations might fairly be expected; in particular, as regards the measures applied to foster the industry of four-fifths of the population. Apparently there is considerable activity in agricultural experiment; and we should hope that the well-tried traditional methods of the peasantry, however absurd at first blush, receive more patient consideration than they sometimes used to receive. We cannot but suspect, however, that the main official interest runs off into surveys, instead of being directed to the means of improved production.

The statistics of sanitation still exhibit very painful aspects. "The health of the European troops in India during 1897 was much worse than the average, owing largely to the prevalence of malarial fevers." Enteric fever carried off 9·01 per 1,000, as against 6·31 the previous year, being specially severe on young and unacclimatised soldiers. While ague sent 26 per cent. of the sick cases to hospital, veneral diseases accounted for 31 per cent. There is very serious matter for reflection in these figures. The ravages of fever, cholera, small-pox, dysentery and diarrhœa, among the general population, work out in frightful statistics, in spite of all sanitary schemes and precautions. Then there were the special visitations of famine and plague in reinforcement of the usual maladies. The police appear to have displayed higher qualities, often in the face of exceptional difficulties; but the service evidently needs to be strengthened. The progress of education will help in a way. Still, though much has been done in education, the reports indicate yet more decisively the weakness of the whole system. More money is needed. Indeed, wherever one looks closely into the reported results of the various departments of internal administration, one comes inevitably to the same conclusion. The

taxpayers' money is expended in the wrong place—on the wrong side of the frontier. The whole land is crying for the solid establishment and maintenance of a peace policy, and for internal sustenance and development.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

(FROM A PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.)

WHEN I last wrote I explained many reasons for expecting that the Government would suffer a rebuff at Oldham, in which town a double election was then going on. Since then the event has proved even better than my anticipation. The Government has lost both the seats in the great and typical Lancashire centre, and has lost them by overwhelming majorities. Put briefly the Liberals have turned what at the last general election was a Conservative majority of 1,209 into a Liberal majority of 2,820. That is to say there has been a transfer of more than 4,000 votes! This following on the remarkable verdicts in Edinburgh given only a week or two ago must make the Tories feel somewhat nervous. The reception the two visitors received in the House of Commons when they took their seats was one of uproarous welcome, for it happens that they have come at the right time.

The fact is, the Opposition at the fag end of the Session are showing more "go" than they have done for many a day. It is this fatuous Parsons Relief Bill which has stirred up and united the Liberals. The Government has done its opponents an infinite service by bringing in this most scandalous of all its bribe and dole measures. And bad as the Bill is in itself, the manner in which the Government is hustling it through the House, ramming it down the public throat, is even more disgraceful. Things had come to such a pass on Tuesday that there was a succession of scenes, noisy, exciting, passionate, which reminded one of the old days when Home Rule was before the House and when scenes were common. The afternoon began in a lively style. Late on the previous evening the Chairman had called a Liberal member to order, saying that his speech was more suited to the hustings than to the House. The Liberal retorted that he had been doing a good deal of hustings work of late with very satisfactory results. It happened that the first Tory speech on Tuesday was a wild and irrelevant harangue by Mr. Long, whereupon Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman amid roars of laughter and cheering declared that he wondered that the right hon. gentleman had not been called to order, for surely his speech had been more suited to the hustings than to the House! This neat backhander, administered at once to Mr. Long and the Chairman, gave the utmost satisfaction to Sir Henry's followers.

A little later that other Liberal leader who dearly loves a storm, Sir William Harcourt, was in evidence. He was speaking when the Chairman called him to order stating that what Sir William was urging would come in on a later amendment. Sir William asked how he was to know that that amendment would be in order when it was reached, and this very pertinent enquiry inflamed the young and noisy Tories dreadfully. They shouted, nay, literally howled, for "Order" in a most edifying manner. Sir William was not in the least upset, contenting himself with the remark that he had not the least intention of impugning the Chairman's impartiality, but it was impossible for anyone to know what the Chairman's ruling on an amendment might be until that amendment was reached. And a few minutes later Sir William's forebodings were shown to be justified. This was the position—the committee was debating an amendment by Mr. Samuel Evans when suddenly Mr. Balfour proposed to apply the closure to what is known as a compartment of the Bill. In this way he would sweep away 28 amendments without a word being said about them. And among them was the very amendment for which Sir William Harcourt had been told to wait. The uproar was immense. Shouts of "Gag, gag," rang through the House, even grave front-benchmen joining in with gusto. And to increase the excitement it was found that Mr. Balfour in his petulant eagerness had been "a little too previous", as the Americans say. For the Chairman said he could not accept such a proposal until the amendment actually before the House was disposed of. The Liberals shouted with joy at this direct snub from the Chairman to the Leader of the House. Mr. Balfour retorted by closuring that amendment so as to get it out of the way. This, of course, meant two divisions, one on the closure and the other on the amendment, and each division meant shouts of all sorts and general hubbub.

At length Mr. Balfour thought his chance had come, and so once more he proposed the closure on the compartment before mentioned. To the uproarious delight of the Opposition the Chairman once again declined to put it. He said there was an important amendment on the paper by Mr. Atherley Jones that really ought to be debated. The other amendments the Chairman would have allowed to go, but their proud and anxious authors kept hopping up one after the other with pathetic protests, points of order, questions and so forth till the House seemed to be a perfect pandemonium. At length all these gentlemen agreed to give way in order to allow a debate on Mr. Atherley Jones's amendment, and so for a time the debate jogged along quietly and Mr. Balfour had to put up with his snubs as best he could. Then at ten o'clock he began to pull himself together again, and got rid of this terrible amendment by his favourite weapon the closure, so that at last, at half-past ten, he was able to get his compartment closure motion put—three or four hours after his first move, and after an amount of friction that had thoroughly roused the Opposition. He came out of the incident very badly indeed, for a leader of the House is not supposed to ignore so utterly the rights of minorities as to try to stifle discussion to such an extent that the Chairman has to step in twice. And just before the House adjourned the same night Mr. Balfour by the same methods succeeded in getting two more lines of the Bill through without amendment, and without discussion. The public will note these things. A Bill which has to be smuggled and hustled through in this way is one of which its authors are evidently not proud.

While all this wild work was going on in the Commons there was a significant bit of work being transacted in the Lords. The reader may remember that some weeks ago a Bill went to the Lords, with the unanimous approval of the Commons, with the object of making the supply of seats for shop assistants in Scotland compulsory. Lord Salisbury covered the proposal with bitter ridicule and the Bill was thrown out without even a division. This led to emphatic protests from all sorts of quarters, notably from many of the leading women of the day—for the case for some such Bill is supported by nearly every competent authority of the day. On Tuesday a Bill exactly the same in every particular, except that it is to apply to England and Ireland instead of to Scotland came to the Lords for second reading. It had also passed the Commons without any opposition. Lord Salisbury was discreet enough this time to suppress any tendency on his part to chuckle and chortle over the sufferings of a defenceless class. But he was still bitterly opposed to the Bill, and he argued against it, trotting out those fusty old predictions of what fearful things would happen to trade if such interferences were permitted which have done service ever since Lord Ashley (better known by his later title, Lord Shaftesbury) began his beneficent labours for the workers in factories and mines. Indeed the Prime Minister implored the promoters of the Bill to withdraw it, and let the Government make a searching enquiry! It is only a few days since the Premier was sneering at the futility of official enquiries, and the attempt at shelving the question was a little too transparent even for the House of Lords. So after an animated debate the Lords, in spite of the appeals from their Leader, passed the Bill through its second reading by 73 to 28—a majority of 45—nearer three to one than two to one!

The electoral contest in East St. Pancras has just gone against the Liberals, but it is by a markedly reduced majority that the Tories keep the seat, so that after all the result confirms the rising of the Liberal tide. The Parsons Dole Bill, about which I have written so fully, was of course a leading factor in the fight, for under the Bill London will pay £19,000 a year to the parsons and will receive £900. That is to say £18,000 will go from the struggling overtaxed and overrated shopkeeper in London to the country parsons. And to the rich as well as the poor. No wonder the little tradesman here, whose life is a continual struggle, for whom the legislature has done next to nothing, and whose lot is far less preferable than that of

the working man, no wonder I say, he is beginning to kick at the notion of helping to pay rates for gentlemen getting their £1,000 a year and more. The only wonder is that he has not kicked a bit harder. This Bill will be heard of again—especially at the next general election, an election which will make a clean sweep of the Unionists so far as holding office is concerned.

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

THURSDAY, July 6.—The Prince of Wales was presented with the freedom of the City of Edinburgh.

At Osgoldcross Sir John Austin, the Radical member, who had declared himself opposed to Local Veto and resigned his seat to test the opinion of the constituency, was re-elected with a majority of 2,925 votes over Mr. C. Roberts, also a Radical, who supported Local Veto. The poll was 5,818 to 2,893; so that Sir John more than doubled his opponent's vote.—At Oldham, Mr. Emmott and Mr. Runciman, the Radical candidates, defeated Mr. Winston Spencer Churchill and Mr. Mawdsley. This is a gain of two seats for the Liberals—four votes on a division. The mean Radical majority was 1,410.

Subject to the consent of Parliament, the Treasury undertook to contribute £45,000 towards the cost of the projected National Antarctic Expedition, provided a like sum be raised from other sources.

With a view to carrying out efficiently the policy of increasing the efficiency and mobility of the British forces in South Africa, and of ensuring the security of the British frontier, a number of special service officers were despatched from London to South Africa, to organise the residents as well as the police and local forces on the frontier.

Mr. Hofmeyr again interviewed the Transvaal Executive at Pretoria. The Volksraad met in secret session. The results of the deliberations were not authoritatively published, and the reports were not definite or clear.

FRIDAY, July 7.—Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman asked Mr. Balfour if he had any statement to make to the House of Commons in regard to the apparently new declaration of policy contained in the following paragraph just officially communicated to the Press:—"The Commander-in-Chief has been engaged in completing the organisation and composition of the larger force which it will be necessary to despatch to South Africa in the event of the negotiations at present in progress with the Government of the Transvaal proving unsuccessful." Mr. Balfour said he did not think there was any declaration of policy in that paragraph, but he conceived that the War Office would be extremely wanting in the most ordinary and obvious duties if they were not prepared for any emergency, however undesirable and unlikely, that could possibly arise.

Mr. Balfour received a deputation on the proposed tunnel between Scotland and Ireland (at points near Stranraer and Belfast). Lords Spencer and Wolseley had written in favour of the scheme; several engineers spoke to its practicability; and it was stated that a group of financiers were ready to make the tunnel if the Government would guarantee three per cent. on the cost when it was opened for traffic. Mr. Balfour offered certain objections, but undertook to bring the subject before his colleagues.

The Third Committee of the Peace Conference received from M. Descamps a verbal report on the work of the Drafting Committee in elaborating the arbitration scheme. The next sitting was postponed until the 17th inst. in order to enable delegates to obtain instructions from their Governments.

General Zurlinden was superseded in the military governorship of Paris by General Brugère, who was chief of the late President Carnot's military household.

The action of the London tea merchants in reference to the withdrawal of the "draft" by the Indian dealers and sellers led to somewhat serious complications. The sellers at Calcutta withdrew their stocks from the sale-rooms.

SATURDAY, July 8.—The Prince of Wales reviewed the Metropolitan Volunteers—some 26,000 men—on the Horse Guards' Parade. The Duke of York and the Duke of Cambridge passed the saluting-point at the head of the corps of which they are honorary colonels.

The Indian Currency Committee's report was issued. We deal with its contents elsewhere.

The new Transvaal franchise proposals were announced. They would give the franchise on certain conditions to all persons who had resided in the South African Republic since 1890; those who went there in 1891 would receive it in a year; those who went in 1892 in two years; and so forth. The proposals were not favoured in Johannesburg. Mr. Schreiner approved them; but the leaders of the Progressive party and the citizens of Cape Town were reported to repudiate them.

MONDAY, July 10.—A meeting "to protest against the reckless threats of war with the Transvaal," was held at St. Martin's Town Hall, London, under the presidency of Mr. G. W. E. Russell.

Some anxiety was reported from Capetown as to the interpretation of the latest proposals of the Transvaal Volksraad, it being feared that the number of Uitlander seats now conceded might be neutralised by the subsequent creation of Boer constituencies. Mr. Hofmeyr returned to Capetown, and declared himself satisfied with the result of his negotiations at Pretoria. The Uitlander Council at Johannesburg expressed regret at Mr. Schreiner's statement of his views, and declined to admit him as a competent or impartial judge of the franchise question.

The Grand Duke George, brother of the Tsar and heir apparent to the throne of Russia, died in the Caucasus from hemorrhage in the throat.—The Russian Council of the Empire had submitted to it by the Ministry of the Interior a set of new regulations for the supply of food to famine-stricken districts. The main feature of the scheme was that the work of distribution was taken out of the hands of the zemstvos, or village councils.

Martial law was declared in the city and department of Belgrade owing to certain revelations made in course of the enquiry into the attack on the ex-King Milan. An arch-priest and the whole of a newspaper staff were arrested.

TUESDAY, July 11.—The Archbishop of Canterbury, speaking at the Canterbury Diocesan Conference, reasserted his belief that the crisis in the Church would yield to the quiet efforts of remedy in course of application by the bishops. In the discussion of the question of a Court of Appeal in ecclesiastical causes, he declared that, while he had no fear of talk about disestablishment and disendowment, what he did fear was disruption. "Those who brought that about would be guilty of the very heaviest sin."

The naval mobilization for the approaching manœuvres was carried out at Portsmouth, Chatham, and Devonport.

Answering Mr. Davitt in the House of Commons, Mr. Wyndham said the bullet known as Mark IV. had been the service bullet of the British army since February, 1898, and as such had been issued to our troops in South Africa. He could not lay before the House a report either of the experiments which led to the adoption of that bullet or the more recent experiments, since they contained confidential information. These experiments were not merely of a surgical character. They were conducted to solve a number of physical problems, in considering which the humanitarian side of the question was not left out of sight. Asked by Mr. Dillon whether the bullet had not been constructed to expand on striking, like Dum-Dum bullets, Mr. Wyndham said the bullet had been constructed to achieve a number of objects, one of which was that its calibre should be greater later on than when it left the muzzle of the rifle.

At the Bisley Meeting Oxford beat Cambridge for the Humphry Cup by 758 points to 716; Major the Hon. T. F. Fremantle won the Waldegrave; and the Regular officers beat the Volunteers.

Mr. Hofmeyr reiterated his opinion that the Transvaal proposals were just and equitable, and stated that the Boers were under no illusion as to the outcome of possible war, but preferred taking the risk to sacrificing their independence. The full text of the resolution of the Uitlander Council of Johannesburg, now published, emphasised the disappointment of that body with the Transvaal proposals.

At a meeting of French Ministers the Minister of the Interior stated that the report on the Orleanist intrigues published yesterday was authentic, and that an enquiry would be made as to how it reached the newspapers.

The Tsar issued a manifesto announcing the death of the Tsarevitch and the passing of the right of succession, "so long as it may not please the Lord to bless us with the birth of a son," to his next brother, the Grand Duke Michael.

The Vienna correspondent of the *Times* reported that it was stated in Belgrade that the attempted assassination of ex-King Milan was the outcome of a formidable and widespread conspiracy. The semi-official newspapers in Vienna threw some doubt, however, upon the alleged revelations and urged the Servian Government to treat the numerous persons under arrest with scrupulous fairness.

WEDNESDAY, July 12.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer, replying to a deputation which drew attention to the very high rates charged by the companies controlling the telegraphic communication with India and the Colonies, admitted that the rates were too high, at any rate, between England and India, and promised to represent the matter to the Cabinet. But he refused to entertain the idea of cheapening telegrams at the expense of the taxpayer.

Mr. Asquith, speaking at a house dinner at the National Liberal Club, declared that the Government had completely failed to carry out their programme of social reform. He attacked the Tithe Bill, and complained that neither the Factory Bill nor the promised Bill to deal with dangerous oil had been pressed forward. Such Bills as had been passed had been due to partiality or timidity. Mr. Asquith avoided both foreign and colonial subjects.

Mr. Thomas Wrightson, the Conservative candidate, won

the election in East St. Pancras, but Mr. Costelloe, the Radical candidate reduced the majority from 289 to 187. The poll was 2,610 to 2,423.

The Capetown branch of the Afrikander Bond approved of the Transvaal franchise proposals, as well as of the proposal for the settlement of disputes arising on the Convention by means of arbitration. Mr. Hofmeyr said it would be shameful to declare war on account of the difference between the schemes of Sir Alfred Milner and President Kruger.

M. André Lebon, former French Minister of the Colonies, addressed a letter to the Government explaining the reason why Captain Dreyfus was put in irons while a prisoner on Devil's Island. There were fears he said, that the captive would be assisted to escape, and irons were put on him until the palisaded hut could be made ready for his reception. M. Lebon denied interference with the prisoner's correspondence.

The Emperor of Germany declared that he would persist in promoting legislation for the severe punishment of those who try to prevent other people from working. He said he was determined to follow what he thought the right path and to defy all opposition.

The prohibition of a lecture on the Armenian atrocities by M. Tchiraz, a journalist, who went to the Hague with the object of attracting attention to the Armenian question, caused excitement in Holland.

JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS.

MEMORIAL TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

The Indian Parliamentary Committee at its meeting on Monday last (July 10) adopted a Memorial to the Secretary of State for India urging the separation of Judicial from Executive functions in the Indian administration. The Memorial, which was signed by Lord Hobhouse, Sir Richard Garth, Sir Richard Couch, Sir Charles Sargent, Sir W. Markby, Sir John B. Phear, Sir John Scott, Sir W. Wedderburn, Sir Roland K. Wilson, and Mr. Herbert J. Reynolds, was forwarded to Lord George Hamilton with the following covering letter :—

To the Right Honourable
LORD GEORGE FRANCIS HAMILTON, M.P.,
Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India.
India Office, Whitehall, S.W.

My Lord,—We have the honour, on behalf of the signatories, to forward for your favourable consideration a Memorial urging the separation of Judicial from Executive functions in the Indian administration.

It is hoped that the expense involved will not be great; but even if the cost is considerable the improved condition of Indian finance will, in the opinion of this Committee, justify the expenditure necessary to carry out this much needed reform. The financial statement just presented to Parliament shows that the Government of India anticipate a surplus of Rx.4,759,400 for 1898-9, and of Rx.3,932,600 for 1889-1900; also we notice that the Secretary of State has been able to sanction an increase to the emoluments of the High Court judges. This Committee therefore considers that the time is opportune for dealing with this question, and trusts that funds will be provided to place the lower grades of the judicial service upon a satisfactory footing, and give effect to a measure earnestly desired by the Indian community.

We have, etc.,
Signed { W. WEDDERBURN, *Chairman*,
J. HERBERT ROBERTS, *Secretary*,
Indian Parliamentary Committee.

House of Commons, July 10, 1899.

The official acknowledgment was as follows:

India Office, Whitehall, S.W.
July 11, 1899.

Sir,—I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th instant, which will be laid before the Secretary of State for India in Council for his consideration.

I am, etc.
Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart, M.P. C. J. LYALL.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

INDIAN HIGH COURT JUDGES.

To THE EDITOR OF "INDIA."

SIR,—I believe you are right in stating that "the High Courts" are the most respected institutions in the country," that is, in India; and I will not venture to disagree with your opinion that "they are respected more for their honesty than for their legal capacity." But it seems worth while to draw more particular attention to the sapping process that has been going on for some time back under the official system of appointment. You yourself, indeed, have pointed out that "some revised system of appointment" is "urgently needed;" for Lord George Hamilton "could readily obtain far superior men for the money." Your Bombay correspondent, too, laid stress on this point last week. The higher emoluments, he said, will not be grudged "*provided competent men are selected;*" but he added, quite justly, "some of the recent appointments to Indian High Courts are far from satisfactory," and he had particular cases in his mind. The point seems important enough to be emphasised.

If the High Courts be indeed "the most respected institutions" in India, it is surely of the first importance that they should be maintained in high respect. There is no concealment on the part of the profession that at least one of the High Courts has recently fallen into a poor reputation for ability; and this professional opinion has been taken up and confirmed by popular report. Moreover, there is no doubt that other High Courts, in India as well as in the Strand, are more or less marred by inferior members of the Bench. The fact, and the reason for the fact, are both concisely stated by Mr. V. Krishnaswami Iyer, a vakil of the Madras High Court and editor of the *Madras Law Journal*, and therefore a most competent witness, in his article on "The Administration of Justice in India" in the recent volume on "Indian Politics" (Madras: G. A. Natesan). This is what Mr. Krishnaswami says :—

> The Chartered High Courts have had a great hold upon the confidence of the public. In recent years they have begun to lose some portion of that confidence. Barrister judges have been sent to this country on account of political or personal friendship or party ties, and not for proved legal attainments or keenness of judicial insight. Appointments are freely made by successive Secretaries of State, reckless of consequences, and the supreme importance of maintaining the reputation and prestige of the High Courts has been grievously overlooked.

Again, the Madras correspondent of the *Indian Spectator*, in the issue for June 8, to hand this morning, openly says: "I fear a grave calamity is threatening to overtake the High Court." He refers to the alleged engineering of the present Chief Justice in respect of a successor. And he says generally: "It is now well known that the highest tribunal in the Presidency has vastly deteriorated in tone in consequence of the policy of the Government of regulating promotions according to no recognised principle." Here, then, is a profound mischief at work, and there seems to be no remedy for it except the exercise of some little discretion on the part of the Secretary of State.

Mr. Richard Harrington, the last appointment from this country (to Calcutta), is surely a fortunate man. He possesses the technical qualifications, and is no doubt personally a very worthy gentleman. But how has he proved his "legal attainments or keenness of judicial insight?" If the Bar had been set to guess who would be the new judge, it is safe to say that scores of men—nay, hundreds—would have been mentioned before him. In fact, he was a quite unknown barrister—known only to a few immediate friends. Nor was he known to possess any specially comprehensive knowledge of jurisprudence, which might have been even a better title than a good deal of small practice. He may, of course, develop into a great judge; but where are the grounds for such an expectation? The Indian bar and the Indian public have a good right to complain. It would be folly to suppose that even less creditable appointments are not waiting to be announced. This is undoubtedly a serious matter, on which Indians ought to speak out boldly.

The increase of salaries of the puisne judges is a very trifling affair. Perhaps it was not unwise to reduce by three years the period of service qualifying for pension; for it is a misfortune in every way to have debilitated judges on the Bench. But see what is the meaning of compulsory retirement at sixty. On an average your retired judge will draw his pension for at least ten years. Multiply the rupees by ten; multiply the product by the number of retired judges; and see what a load is laid upon the country in these pensions. There will be several generations of pensioners all contemporary. For example, we have now no less than three ex-Chief Justices of Bengal—all good men; long life to them—Sir Richard Couch, Sir Richard Garth, Sir Comer Petheram, at £1,800 per annum apiece. With the shorter qualifying period there will probably be four or five to swell the multiplying figure! It may be gravely doubted whether pensions should not be wholly abolished and the annual pay reasonably increased, so that the judge may be left to make his own provision for old age. If a barrister gave up a large income, as most barristers do in England when they step up to the Bench, then a pension is intelligible. But the case is very different when a barrister goes out to an Indian judgeship. In that case there is no loss to reimburse. On the contrary!

There is yet another aspect of the question—if I may trespass further on your narrow space. It is this. Why send out so many barrister judges? Everybody knows that the Bench could be manned to a much larger extent than it is by Native judges. Mr. Justice Mahmoud has not left his equal on the Allahabad Bench; there has been no one at Madras to compare with Mr. Justice Muthuswami Aiyar. The existing Native judges on the bench of the High Courts are as good, man for man, as the English occupants of the bench. In point of legal accomplishment and capacity, or in point of impartiality or judicial rectitude, they are not a whit behind their English *confrères*. No unprejudiced and competent witness would for an instant suggest otherwise. If authority be necessary I cal

the Earl of Selborne, recently Lord Chancellor of England. Lord Selborne said this:—

My lords, for some years I practised in Indian cases before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and during those years there were few cases of any Imperial importance in which I was not concerned. I had considerable opportunities of observing the manner in which in civil cases the Native judges did their duty, and have no hesitation in saying—and I know this was also the opinion of the judges during their time—that the judgments of the Native judges bore most favourable comparison as a general rule with the judgments of the English judges. I should be sorry to say anything in disparagement of the English judges, who as a class are most anxious to discharge their duty carefully; but I repeat that I have no hesitation in saying that in every instance, in respect of integrity, of learning, of knowledge, of the soundness and satisfactory character of the judgments arrived at, the judgments of the Native judges were quite as good as those of English judges.

This deliberate and emphatic pronouncement of Lord Selborne's seems conclusive. Certainly no man that understands law and is acquainted with the facts will dare to dispute it. That being so, I again ask: Why send out so many barrister judges from England? Why not save India's money? Why not fulfil the terms of the gracious Proclamation, and let the Native barrister have his rightful chances of promotion?—I am, Sir, etc.,

Temple, July 10, 1899. Q.

THE CURRENCY COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

The "Times."

The Report of the Indian Currency Committee in a comparatively brief compass gives a lucid, closely-reasoned, and ably-written *résumé* of a somewhat complicated question and of a great mass of evidence from men of very various opinions. . . . The Committee speak in no uncertain tone and recommend no half-measures. . . . . They hold that the gold currency is the only sound basis for the gold standard, and they believe that it can be established. At the same time they recognise that the circumstances of India are very different from those that obtain in this country, that, owing to the smallness of the great majority of transactions, gold coins will not circulate to any great extent among the mass of the people, and that complete convertibility as we understand it would impose responsibilities which the Indian Government ought to be careful not to assume. The analogy for the proposed Indian system would rather be found in France, where the Bank is not bound to give gold in exchange for silver, though it does so at its own discretion, or in Germany, where a theoretical obligation to pay in gold on demand is in practice converted into a discretionary system, as in France. . . . . The Committee emphatically dissent from what was the proposal of the Indian Government, to obtain gold by borrowing, and three members of the Committee, in order to make assurance doubly sure, have written a supplementary report to enforce the objections to that course. It is on trade support, as they point out, that the maintenance of the gold standard must in the long run depend, and it would be very unwise to resort out of impatience to artificial methods which involve a load of sterling debt. . . . . The circumstances of gold production are now very favourable to operations such as the Committee contemplate, even if the expected influx of British capital into India under the new conditions did not automatically provide a sufficient gold reserve. (July 10.)

The "Manchester Guardian."

There is nothing in the final report of the Committee appointed little more than a year ago to consider the proposals of the Government of India "for the establishment of a gold standard in India" which will be regarded as unexpected by anyone who is familiar with the question and the history and work of the Committee. . . . . In one respect, indeed, we might have expected that the Committee would have been bolder than it has been. The witnesses by whose evidence and opinions it has clearly been most influenced, and whose arguments it has practically adopted, agreed that the best solution of the problem in the interest of India would be attained by means of an international agreement; and regret was expressed that the special efforts of the United States and France in 1897 to arrive at an agreement which would remove from the Indian currency system any element of artificiality had been too summarily dismissed by Lord Salisbury and his colleagues. In view of this testimony, and the letter from the American Secretary of State submitted by Lord Aldenham, we have previously expressed the opinion that the Committee ought, in the first place, to recommend the British Government to take steps for reopening negotiations with the United States with reference to the possibility of an agreement on the basis of a reduced ratio. The fact that the Committee has not done so, lays it open to the charge of having too readily fallen in with that disposition to suppress any serious attempt at agreement which has been observable from the first. The bimetallists may, however, console themselves with the reflection that the report is not a declaration against bimetallism, or, in other words, against an international agreement for the free coinage of both the precious metals in a common and fixed ratio. On the contrary, the particular plan proposed is recommended on the ground that "it would not preclude India hereafter from considering responsible proposals for an international agreement if circumstances should arise to render such negotiations practicable."

Briefly stated, the plan proposed is that of Lord Northbrook, who as we have before pointed out, is avowedly an advocate of a gold standard for India only so long as an international agreement "at a reasonable ratio" is impracticable. Lord Northbrook urged in his evidence that if sovereigns are made legal tender in India at the ratio of fifteen rupees to the sovereign, and the mints in India are open to the free coinage of sovereigns at that ratio, a gold currency will be gradually established in India—at least for payments in large amounts—and that eventually gold will accumulate in the Indian Treasury to an extent sufficient to enable the Government to redeem currency notes in certain specified minimum amounts either in gold sovereigns or in silver rupees. It is assumed that there would be practically no demand for such redemption except for comparatively large payments, chiefly of an international character. These recommendations have been adopted by the Committee, and except for the proposal to open the mints to the coinage of sovereigns from gold tendered for that purpose, and the enactment that a sovereign in India shall be a legal tender there for the discharge of a debt of fifteen rupees, it amounts simply to the maintenance of the *status in quo*. It must, however, be understood that it is not proposed that the Indian Government shall give sovereigns freely in exchange for rupees, though it will be called upon to give rupees in exchange for sovereigns. The rupees will continue, at least for the present, to be unlimited legal tender. How far this one-sided arrangement will prove successful in India can only be determined by experiment. In favour of its success is the recent and continued great increase in the output of gold, the admittedly greater suitability of the rupee for the ordinary currency of India, and the fact that a similar system is maintained in France and the United States. Of course, under the scheme itself the Government will in certain cases be called upon practically to give sovereigns for rupees, inasmuch as large currency notes may be obtained against rupee deposits and such large notes may be eventually cashed at the Treasuries in sovereigns. Herein lies the danger. France is protected against this risk by a practically inexhaustible stock of gold; and the United States is protected at present by a large accumulation of gold consequent on extraordinarily favourable balances of trade. But only three years ago even the United States was compelled to incur a huge additional gold debt in order to replenish its gold stock and maintain the parity. (July 11.)

The "Daily News."

The Committee, of which Sir Henry Fowler was Chairman have drawn up a State Paper not only important to politicians, but interesting to all students of Indian history and economic science. On the two principal questions referred to them, Sir Henry Fowler and his colleagues, including a member of the Cabinet, the Permanent Secretary to the Treasury, and Sir David Barbour, formerly Minister of Finance at Calcutta, express unanimously a strong opinion. They all hold, first, that the Indian mints should not be reopened to the free coinage of silver, and secondly, that gold should be the standard of value in India. On the ratio to be fixed between gold and silver, the Committee are not unanimous. But the Chairman and the majority consider that the rupee should be taken at one and fourpence. This is the point at which it now stands, and at which so accomplished a financier as Sir Francis Mowatt, thinks it is likely to remain for a long time to come. These conclusions carry immense weight, and, supported as they are, except as regards the ratio, by Mr. Holland, the member for Rotherham, who has been President of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, they will put the finishing stroke to bimetallism. With a gold standard in India, there would be no more room for bimetallism in the world. It will be seen therefore that this report is not merely departmental, and does not solely concern India. It ranks with the report of the Bullion Committee of 1810, which led to the resumption of payments in specie, as a decisive and authoritative deliverance upon a fundamental principle of political economy. We must bear in mind from the outset in examining this report that the avowed object of closing the Indian mints to silver six years ago, was the ultimate establishment of a gold standard. Had it been otherwise, the bimetallists might fairly have said that Mr. Gladstone and Lord Kimberley had partly come round to their views. For silver is the standard of value in India, as gold is the standard of value in England, and we regard it as a consequence from the latter proposition that the Mint should be bound by law to coin all the gold bullion it receives. The influential Committee which has just concluded its labours examined nearly fifty witnesses, held more than forty sittings, and at length adopted the principle of a gold standard which the late Government had before them in 1893. Lord George Hamilton cannot pass by a recommendation which he has himself invited. He must either act upon it, or explain why he refuses to do so.

The simple reopening of the mints, and return to a silver standard, are favoured by Indian witnesses who believe that a low rupee and a low exchange encourage the export trade of India. It has in the same way been argued by Lancashire merchants that a silver standard in India, combined with a gold standard at home, operates as a bounty upon Indian produce and acts injuriously to them. We believe that both views, if indeed they be not one view, are fallacious. In the trade of nations money is a counter, and you cannot, as the hero of "Happy Thoughts" supposed, win a game of whist by placing a florin under a candlestick, even if you say "Double, treble, and the rub," as you do so. "A country as a whole," said the Government of Lord Lansdowne in 1892, "makes no gain in its international trade by a depreciation of its standard, since the extra price received for its exports is balanced by the extra price paid for its imports." That very plain and simple truth is fatal to the theory of bounties and artificial stimulus, and all the rest of it. In recommending the adoption of gold as the measure of value for India the Committee quote a very neat and apt observation from the evidence of Professor Marshall. "It would be," said this great economist, "like a movement towards bringing the railway gauge on the side branches of the world's railway into unison with the main lines." India wants capital, and it is only from countries with a gold standard that she can get it. (July 10.)

The "Daily Chronicle."

The Report on the Indian Currency just issued by Sir H. Fowler's Committee is a strong and a singularly lucid document. The Committee have not been altogether unanimous, but they have arrived at two or three broad conclusions which will carry weight. In the first

place, they decide absolutely in favour of the introduction of gold monometallism, and its adoption in a perfectly simple space, with the sovereign as the standard coin, and a fixed rate at which the rupee coinage may be exchanged against it. The majority of the Committee fix the rate at 1s. 4d., chiefly on the ground that that has in fact become the stable value of the rupee, in consequence of the recent Government arrangements since the closing of the mints. Doubtless there will be debates on these difficult questions; but the Committee is a strong one, and it makes a strong case for its bold proposal. (July 10.)

Imperial Parliament.

Friday, July 7.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Military Bullet)—Return presented—relative thereto [Address June 8; Lord George Hamilton]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 264.]

East India (Loans raised in India)—Copy presented—of Return of all Loans raised in India, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ended on March 31, 1899, etc. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 265.]

East India (Indian Currency Committee, 1898)—Copy presented—of Report of the Committee appointed to enquire into the Indian Currency [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Monday, July 10.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIAN TROOPS SERVING ABROAD.

Mr. Buchanan asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he would state what Indian troops were now serving outside the limits of India, and in what places:

And, whether the expenses of any of the troops so serving outside India were borne by the Indian Exchequer.

Lord G. Hamilton: The 1st Bengal infantry, at the Mauritius, is the only regiment of the Indian army now employed outside the limits of India. Besides these there are a certain number of Volunteers from various Indian regiments who are in the service of the Uganda and other Companies. The expenses of none of them are borne by the Indian Exchequer.

Tuesday, July 11.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE ADVOCATE-GENERAL OF BENGAL.

Mr. Pickersgill asked the Secretary of State for India whether Sir Charles Paul, the Advocate-General of Bengal, was at present in Europe:

What was the period of his leave of absence from India:

Whether anyone had been appointed to discharge the duties of the office, some of which were of a quasi-judicial character, during his absence; and in particular to whom could a person erroneously convicted apply for a certificate that there was error in the decision in point of law, as provided by section 25 of the Letters Patent of 1865:

And who was empowered, in a case tried by the High Court, to enter a *nolle prosequi*, in pursuance of section 333 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

Lord G. Hamilton: Sir Charles Paul is at present in Europe on leave which expires on December 31, 1899. Mr. J. T. Woodroffe, of the Calcutta Bar, has been appointed to discharge the duties of his office, including those mentioned in the third and fourth paragraphs of the question, during his absence.

SOVEREIGNS AND RUPEES.

Mr. Maclean asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, under the scheme of the Currency Commissioners, sovereigns would be a legal tender in India at all places and for all sums down to the value of £1, or only at certain specified centres of trade and for considerable amounts:

And, whether, in ordinary inland mercantile transactions, sovereigns would be exchangeable against rupees in a fixed ratio, or, as they were now, at a frequently varying valuation in the open market.

Lord G. Hamilton: The proposal of the Indian Currency Committee is that the sovereign shall be made a legal tender and current coin in India; and they make no recommendation that this shall be restricted to certain specified centres of trade or to considerable amounts.

If the sovereign is declared by law to be legal tender at a fixed ratio, it will be open to any debtor in any part of India to discharge his debt in sovereigns at that ratio.

Thursday, July 13.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

COOPER'S HILL ENGINEERS.

Mr. Kimber asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he had arrived at any conclusion upon the case of the senior Cooper's Hill Engineers, which some few months ago he stated was under consideration by the Government; and whether their complaint that their careers had been ruined by the terms of their engagement being broken, and that they were reduced towards the close of their service into a position of great anxiety and distress, could in any way be met and alleviated:

And, whether he would lay upon the Table, and cause to be circulated, the Government of India's despatch, No. 15, Public Works, dated January 28, 1890, containing that Government's views upon the whole question; also Copy of a Minute by Sir George Chesney written in January, 1890 (referred to in that despatch), and its enclosures.

Lord G. Hamilton: I stated on June 15 in this House that a despatch, conveying my decision on this subject was then on its way to India. Since then it has no doubt been received and acted upon in the manner which I described. A motion for the publication of the correspondence referred to in the question was put down in 1895, but my predecessor declined to agree to it, and I see no reason for departing from that decision.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS.

Notice has been given of the following questions:—

Sir Cameron Gull: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether under existing regulations an Indian departmental warrant officer being invalided to England during the summer months (non-trooping season) would be compelled either to pay for passages for his family to England or leave them in India, his furlough pay being only £6 or £6 10s. a month:

And whether it is proposed to take any action to remove the grievances of Indian warrant officers as regards furlough pay and passages. [*Friday, July* 14.]

Sir Seymour King: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in admitting the rights of certain of their civil officers to the exchange compensation allowance which was granted generally in 1893 to Anglo-Indian employees of the Indian Government, subject to reservations with regard to certain services and to special circumstances or questions of domicile, the Indian Government, in cases where it has been proved that the recipient's claim to the compensation was good from the first, has nevertheless brought such recipient under regulations which only admit his claim to the compensation as having effect from April 1, 1897:

Whether he is aware of the case of Mr. Charles Edmondstone Ross, of the Public Works Department, who was refused the compensation allowance in 1893 on some interpretation of the law of domicile, but has since been admitted to the privilege, but only with effect from April 1, 1897:

Whether Mr. Ross has applied to the Government of India to grant him the full arrears of allowance having effect from the date when it was granted in 1893, on the ground that he was entitled to it at that date, citing in proof thereof the fact that it was then granted to his brother and sister, both in the Government service, whereas it was refused to him, and that as regards questions of parentage, service, domicile, etc., there was no substantial distinction between the conditions of his case and those of his brother and sister:

And whether he will explain on what ground, while recognising that Mr. Ross had a claim to the allowance, the Government of India has declined to grant him the full arrears of compensation conceded in other and similar cases. [*Friday, July* 14.]

Sir Seymour King: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether married officers of the Indian Staff Corps who come home to attend the Staff College, though allowed personally to rejoin their regiments in India at Government expense, are not entitled to passages for their wives and families:

And whether, seeing that such officers lose a considerable amount of pay in coming home to attend the Staff College, and that moreover the two years at Camberley involve extra expenditure, the Government of India will consider the advisability of allowing married officers some compensation in the shape of passage money for their families or free passage by troopers when rejoining their regiments in India. [*Friday, July* 14.]

NOTICE OF MOTION.

The following notice of Motion appears on the Order Paper of the House of Commons:—

On going into Committee on East India Revenue Accounts:—

Sir William Wedderburn: To move, That under the existing procedure the superintending authority of Parliament over Indian affairs is not effectively exercised; that the salary of the Secretary of State for India should be placed on the Estimates; that the debate on the Indian Budget should be appointed for an earlier day in the Session; and that with a view to the more effectual discharge by this House of its existing duty to the unrepresented Indian taxpayer, the East India Accounts should each year be referred to a Select Committee with instructions to report on any special features deserving the attention of the House.

The P. and O. s.s. "Valette" leaves London for Bombay on July 19, with the following among other passengers:—Major A. H. Wilmer, Major and Mrs. Gordon, Major and Mrs. G. L. Poynder, Capt. A. G. Medley, Capt. W. G. Newbigging, Lieut.-Col. Kellie, Rev. A. N. Banerji, Lieut. W. O. Grant, Major C. F. Garnett, Rev. R. M. Kirwan, Lieut.-Col. and Mrs. Richardson, and the Rev. P. H. Stevenson.

The P. and O. s.s. "Carthage" arrived in London, from Bombay on July 10. Her passenger-list includes the following names: Capt. W. W. Hancock; Lieut.-Col. J. A. Kelley; Col. T. J. McGann; Major A. P. Griffiths; Lieut. H. C. Laveston; Lieut.-Col. A. Pringle; Major C. Corfield; Dr. McDougall; Mr. G. Sen; Capt. and Mrs. C. D. Wise; Surg.-Gen. Churchill; and Capt., Mrs., and Miss Ryan, and child.

SINGER'S SEWING MACHINES.

FOR CASH OR HIRE.

Machines Exchanged and Repaired.

DUPLICATE PARTS, NEEDLES, OIL, &c., ALWAYS IN STOCK.

100 Offices in India, Burma, and Ceylon.

Instructions Free. *Price Lists Free on application.*

The SINGER Manufacturing Co. } 5, CHURCH GATE ST., BOMBAY.

MAHA-BHARATA,

Condensed into English Verse by ROMESH DUTT, C.I.E.

Cheap Edition (*Temple Classics Series*) **Cloth, 1s. 6d., Leather, 2s.**

Edition de Luxe, with an Introduction by the Right Hon. Professor MAX MULLER, and 12 Photogravures from Indian Sources by Miss E. S. HARDY, Cloth 12s. 6d., Parchment 15s. Publishers, DENT & CO., London.

May be had in India through any Indian bookseller.

OPINIONS.

"The impression which his bold undertaking leaves on the reader is certainly that something like what we here read in English may have been recited in India when the war between the Kurus and the sons of Pandu was first sung by the ancient bards of the country." *Prof. Max Muller's Introduction.*

"Mr. Romesh Chandra Dutt is the first scholar who brings to his task a life-long study of the original, with a perfect command of our own language. . . . Puts into vigorous verse the episodes which are still recited in thousands of quiet hamlets, and hundreds of crowded festivals."—*The Times.*

"An interesting Epilogue by the translator further explains the history and scope of the work, and furnishes an instance of the marvellous command of English acquired by educated Bengali gentlemen. The wisdom of the East is worthily presented in attractive binding and printing."—*The Saturday Review.*

"If the Epic could not attract European readers by its intrinsic merits—its noble moral conceptions, its encyclopædic pictures of Indian civilisation in the remote past, its pathos, its delineation of character—still its extraordinary popularity and influence, as described in the translator's eloquent 'Epilogue,' should alone make us curious to learn something of the story of the Kurus and the God-like sons of Pandu."—*The Manchester Guardian.*

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq., President.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England. Gentlemen will be met at London, Edinburgh, Oxford, or Cambridge stations on giving fortnight's notice.

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,

Soho Square, National Hospital, London, W.

Vol. I.—To Concentration of Army on Frontier.

SECOND AFGHAN WAR.

1878-79-80.

By Colonel H. B. HANNA,

Formerly in Punjab Frontier Force and late Commanding at Delhi, Author of "Indian Problems," etc.

PALL MALL GAZETTE.—"Colonel Hanna's tremendous care, completeness and clearness, with his intense conviction, make him a very powerful writer."

ATHENÆUM.—"The ability with which his case is presented is considerable and it is probable that in his main line his view is a well founded one."

MORNING LEADER.—"Colonel Hanna is peculiarly well fitted to handle the multiplicity of questions—political, military, and social—that arise in connection with the Second Afghan War."

A. CONSTABLE, 2, WHITEHALL GARDENS, LONDON.

Price, Net—10s.

Congress Addresses and Resolutions from the first to 1898.

INDIAN POLITICS.

With an Introduction by W. C. BONNERJEE, Esq., Bar.-at-Law.

Price in India, Rs. 2; in England, 4s. (postage 4d. extra).

PART I.—**Original Articles.**

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS. Eardley Norton, Esq., Bar.-at-Law.
ECONOMIC CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE OF INDIA. Rao Bahadur R. N. Mudholkar, B.A., LL.B.
INDIAN ASPIRATIONS UNDER BRITISH RULE. Romesh Chunder Dutt, Esq., C.I.E.
INDIA AND THE CURRENCY QUESTION. Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq.
THE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT QUESTION. John Adam, Esq., M.A., Bar.-at-Law.
THE POVERTY OF INDIA. Alfred Nundy, Esq., Bar.-at-Law.
LINES OF LEGISLATION IN INDIA. P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyar, Esq., B.A., B.L.
THE JURY SYSTEM IN INDIA. Sorab Pestonji N. Wadia, Esq.,
THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN INDIA. V. Krishnaswami Aiyar, Esq., B.A., B.I.
THE STATUS OF INDIANS ABROAD. G. Parameswaran Pillay, Esq., B.A.
RAILWAYS IN INDIA. G. Subramania Aiyar, Esq., B.A.

PART II.—**All the past 13 Congress Presidential Addresses.**

PART III.—**All the past Congress Resolutions.**

In India—Apply to G. A. NATESAN & Co., Publishers, Esplanade, Madras.
In Great Britain—Apply to The Manager of "India," 84-85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.
Remittances must accompany order.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

Dr. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., New Medical Hall, Meerut.

is what its name implies FEVER DESTROYER,

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know
C. E. Wood, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. Narsinga Row.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I ave much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage,
C. S. Srinivasa, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "India," should be made to

The Manager,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliot Stock, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.